UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,156	01/05/2000	Edward L Bayiates	M0995/7002/PJG/AR	1311

26339   7590   06/09/2003

PATENT GROUP
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART
EXCHANGE PLACE, 53 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA   02109

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/478,156	BAYIATES, EDWARD L
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Cam-Y T Truong	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 April 2003</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19, 25-27 and 50-93</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19, 25-27 and 50-93</u> _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>16</u> .   6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1, 17-19, 25, 26, 27, 50, 67, 87, 92-93 in the

amendment filed on 4/7/03.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19, 25-27 and 50-93 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant discussed that Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitations "receiving

data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data

indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented; and

analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in

accordance with a template, wherein said contain data and said format data are

different from said template; and storing the identified content data".

However, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and

format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually

represented" as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server,

are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application

template component contains information about the nature of the data that are

contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview

definitions; data entry and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit,

view, or print a document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document.

The template contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data

fields. The above information shows that the system receives documents from

database servers. A printed document is presented as a visual form of data. Template

information is represented as format data which indicates the manner the content data

is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

" analyzing said visual form of data" as the system access the document and

extract the data from the document (col. 10, lines 50-55) "and identifying at least some

of the content data in accordance with a template" as format the data in accordance

with the template instructions. This information indicates the system identifies the data

for formatting data in accordance with the template instructions (col. 10, lines 50-35);

"storing the identified content data" as displaying data from a template before the

user closes the program. The user optionally elects to save the documents to a local

device (col. 10, lines 55-65).

Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and

said format data are different from said template". However, Stiegemeier teach before

the system displays the document, the system must retrieve a document template from

the server. The template contains formatting the document data (col. 10, lines 5-10).

Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and report format.

The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report

criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report

template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

Applicant also discussed that DuFresne does not disclose analyzing said visual

form of data and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a

template. However, DuFresne teaches as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair

for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The above information shows that the system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output webpage and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15-19 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stiegemeier et al (USP 6192381) in view of Hoth (USP 6233583).

As to claims 1, 17, and 19, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template component contains information about the nature of the data that are

contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview

definitions; data entry and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit,

view, or print a document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document.

The template contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data

fields. The above information shows that the system receives documents from

database servers. A document is presented as a visual form of data. Subject data is

represented as subject data. Template information is represented as format data, which

indicates the manner the content data is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60;

col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

" analyzing said visual form of data" as the system access the document and

extract the data from the document (col. 10, lines 50-55) "and identifying at least some

of the content data in accordance with a template" as format the data in accordance

with the template instructions (col. 10, lines 50-35);

"storing the identified content data" as displaying data from a template before the

user closes the program. The user optionally elects to save the documents to an local

device (col. 10, lines 55-65).

Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and

said format data are different from said template". However, Stiegemeier teach before

the system displays the document, the system must retrieve a document template from

the server. The template contains formatting the document data (col. 10, lines 5-10).

Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and report format.

The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report

criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report

template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report

criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and

end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date

are different from report template to Stiegemeier's system in order to display content

data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 2, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "normalizing the data

representing the visual form of data" as (col. 11, lines 15-30).

As to claim 3, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the data is normalized

.....form of data" as (col. 11, lines 15-55).

As to claim 7, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the data representing

the visual form of data comprises.....outputting ....by a printer" as (col. 13, lines 65-67;

col. 14, lines 1-5).

As to claim 9, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the template includes

.....from the received data" as (col. 11, lines 15-40).

As to claim 15, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the received data further represents a plurality of visual forms of data" as (fig. 5B).

As to claim 16, Stiegemier teaches the claimed limitation "storing the identified content data ......: storing .....visual forms of data" as (fig. 5B-9).

As to claims 18, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation:

"a input port that receives data representing a visual form of data .....visually represented" " as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template component contains information about the nature of the data that are contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview definitions; data entry and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit, view, or print a document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document. The template contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data fields. The above information shows that the system receives documents from database servers. A document is presented as a visual form of data. Subject data is represented as subject data. Template information is represented as format data which indicates the manner the content data is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

"a processor .....a template" as (col. 10, lines 30-55);

"a storage media that stores the identified content data" as (col. 5, lines 60-65).

Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template". However, Stiegemeier teaches before the system displays the document, the system must retrieve a document template from the server. The template contains formatting the document data (col. 10, lines 5-10). Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template to Stiegemeier's system in order to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As claims 25, 26, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the .....represented" as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template component contains information about the nature of the data that are contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview definitions; data entry and editing validation

requirements. When a user wants to edit, view, or print a document, the application

ensures to edit, view or print a document. The template contains instructions for

formatting the document data e.g., names of data fields. The above information shows

that the system has included an input port to receive documents from database servers.

A document is presented as a visual form of data. Subject data is represented as

subject data. Template information is represented as format data which indicates the

manner the content data is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines

15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

" analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content

data in accordance with a template" (col. 10, lines 30-35);

"initiating performing ....content data" as (fig.5B).

Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and

said format data are different from said template". However, Stiegemeier teaches

before the system displays the document, the system must retrieve a document

template from the server. The template contains formatting the document data (col. 10,

lines 5-10). Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and

report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date.

Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different

from report template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report

criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and

end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date

are different from report template to Stiegemeier's system in order to display content

data of report in proper format to a user.

        As claim 27, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation:

        "an input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising

content data and format data indicating the manner in which the .....represented" as

application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a

compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template

component contains information about the nature of the data that are contained in

document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview definitions; data entry

and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit, view, or print a

document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document. The template

contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data fields. The

above information shows that the system has included an input port to receive

documents from database servers. A document is presented as a visual form of data.

Subject data is represented as subject data. Template information is represented as

format data which indicates the manner the content data is to be visually represented

(col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

        " analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content

data in accordance with a template" (col. 10, lines 30-35);

        "initiating performing ....content data" as (fig.5B).

Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template". However, Stiegemeier teach before the system displays the document, the system must retrieve a document template from the server. The template contains formatting the document data (col. 10, lines 5-10). Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template to Stiegemeier's system in order to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

4.   Claims 4-6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Hoth and further in view of Graefe et al (USP 6298342).

As to claim 4, Stiegemeier and Hoth disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 2, except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized......at least two coordinate systems... into a common coordinate system". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitations "the visual form of data is characterized....at least two coordinate systems" as (col. 1, lines 35-60) , "wherein

normalizing the data ....into a common coordinate system" as (col. 1, liens 35-60; col.

2, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of the engine searches the

database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which

matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually

multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store,

state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different

perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one

perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of data. For example, a user may even

select data from a database table in the Microsoft Access database component of

Microsoft Office, transfer it as a single object to Excel component as a rectangle of

spreadsheet cell to Stiegemeier's system in order to display a form in different

dimensions following user's desire.

As to claim 5, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the common

coordiate......visual form of data " as (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5).

As to claim 6, Stiegemeier discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim

4, except the claimed limitation "the template........on the common coordinate system".

However, Stiegemeier teaches that extract the data from the document and format data

in accordance with template instructions. The document may optionally include a code,

which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying data.

A template may use instructions to define a display including data location (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's teaching of extract the data from the document and format data in accordance with template instructions. The document may optionally include a code, which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying data. A template may use instructions to define a display, which include data location in order to display different type of data in proper format or location on screen following user's desire.

As to claim 10, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes ....on coordinate system" as (col. 11, lines 1-15), except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data .....by the coordinate system". However, Graefe teaches that the engine searches the database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of data. For example, a user may even select data from a database table in the Microsoft Access database component of Microsoft Office, transfer it as a single object to Excel component as a rectangle of spreadsheet cell above claimed limitation in col. 1, lines 30-65.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of the engine searches the database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one perspective to another- to rotate the dimensions of data to Stiegemeier's system in order to display a form in different dimensions following user's desire.

5.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Geaghan (USP 5790114).

As to claim 8, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the operating system layer is Windows operating system" as (fig. 3), except the claimed limitation "the data representing the visual form of data is a Windows metafile". However, Geaghan teaches the Windows metafile (col. 19, lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's teaching of Windows metafile to Stiegemeier's system in order to provide a system which enhances the ability to create, retain, and review information.

6.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Graefe and Ishikawa (USP 5933527).

As to claim 11, Stiegemeier discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 9, except the claimed limitation" the visual form of data.......identifying at least some of the content data in the direction". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as displaying a form database with different perspective (col. 1, lines 30-65). Ishikawa teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes information with respect to location of a reference marker and a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions" as a searching range for extracting the areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the coordinate data of said specific points (col. 24, lines 40-50);

"wherein identifying ......content data in the direction" as (col. 24, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of displaying a form database with different perspective and Ishikawa's teaching of a searching range for extracting the areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the coordinate data of said specific points to Stiegemeier's system in order to display a beautiful image on screen to a user.

7.   Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Hoth and further in view of Maejima et al (USP 5327568).

As to claim 12, stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitations:

"displaying a sample ...data" as (fig. 5);

"receiving data from a user....data" as (fig. 5B).

Stiegemeier fails to teaches the claimed limitation "forming the extraction

instruction.....by the user". However, Maejima teaches that extracting the instruction

name from the instruction name section in the instruction templates after designer input

data sets, input pin position coordinate sections 825 (col. 7, lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-

60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill the art at the time the

invention was made to apply Maejima teaching of instruction name from the instruction

name section in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin

position coordinate sections 825 to Stiegemeier's system in order to display data in

proper format following user's desire.

As to claim 13, Stiegemeier and Hoth discloses the claimed limitation subject

matter in claim 12, except the claimed limitation "storing the extraction instruction".

However, Maejima teaches that the instruction template and the information of input and

output data of the instructions are previously stored in the file. This information shows

that all of instruction template is stored in file including extraction information (col. 7,

lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Maejima's teaching of storing

instruction template to Stiegemeier's system and Stiegemeier's system in order to form

a format data for displaying.

As to claim 14, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "storing the

extraction.....visual form of data" as (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5).

8.   Claims 50, 52-54, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 87-89, 92 and 93 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth (USP 6233583).

As to claims 50 and 92, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and

format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually

represented" as (col. 18, lines 35-45; col. 8, lines 60-65);

"analyzing said visual form of data and identifying at least some of the content

data in accordance with a template having a extraction instructions" as shown in fig. 8,

the template/database pair for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each

template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web

page should contain and how the page should look. The processor extracts the HTML

data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. The #page tag extracts

the data in the database. This above information shows that the extraction instructions

can be included in the template to extract HTML data from the text area of the template.

The system specifies each element of the database to identify which template

corresponding to a web page for output webpage and how the web page should look.

As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data files are presented as

the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is

represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24,

lines 24-25);

"storing the identified content data as at least one tag value" as (col. 17, lines 30-

67).

DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and said

format data are different from said template". However, DuFresne teaches that a

template is an HTML form to define contents of a display web page requested by a

client (col. 8, lines 60-65). Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report

criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and

end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date

are different from report template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report

criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and

end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date

are different from report template to DuFresne's system in order to display content data

of report in proper format to a user.

As to claims 52 and 72, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "creating

template" as if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions

to the present template. Selecting delete will remove the template from the database.

This information shows that the system includes the claimed creating template before

deleting template (col. 10, lines 25-33).

As to claims 53 and 73, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "editing said

template" as (col. 10, lines 25-33).

As to claims 54 and 74, DuFresne discloses the claimed limitation subject matter

in claim 53, except the claimed limitation "editing said extraction instruction included in

said template". However, DuFresne teaches that if a template has been modified,

selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor

extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source (col.

11, lines 30-35; col. 10, lines 25-30). It would have been obvious to a person of an

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching

of if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the

present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the

template as the hypertext source in order to allow a user to maintain a database.

As to claims 67 and 93, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data ......visually represented" as (col. 6, lines 55-67);

"applying a template to the visual form of data" as (col. 8, lines 60-67);

"analyzing said visual form of data and identifying a portion of content data in

accordance with said template" as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair for each

element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The above information shows that the system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output web page and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 18, lines 23-25);

" "said template including extraction........from the visual form of data" as the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. This information shows that the extraction instructions can be included in the template to show how to extract HTML data from the text area of the template (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25);

"extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template" as (col. 18, lines 45-55; col. 24, lines 24-25).

DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template". However, DuFresne teaches that a template is an HTML form to define contents of a display web page requested by a client (col. 8, lines 60-65). Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time
the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report
criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and
end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date
are different from report template to DuFresne's system in order to display content data
of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 68, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "applying the template to
previously stored data" as (col. 13, 50-60).

As to claim 70, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing said tag value in
association with a report corresponding to said visual form of data" as (col. 11, lines 30-
35)

As to claim 87, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"a data receiver.....the content data is to be visually displayed" as (fig. 11A&
11B);

"a database in which ....template is stored" as (col. 13, lines 50-55; col. 6, lines
55-65; col. 8, lines 60-67).

"a template runner that applies......at least one tag value" as a template 308
associated with the selected element is retrieved and processed by the server 300. A
template includes HTML tags and tag extensions to define and build a Web page. This

information shows that the system has included a template runner to identify the selected element associated with a template, which includes tags (fig. 14; col. 13, lines 50-55; col. 6, lines 55-65; col. 8, lines 60-67);

a database in which ....template is stored" as (col. 10, lines 29-32).

DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template". However, DuFresne teaches that a template is an HTML form to define contents of a display web page requested by a client (col. 8, lines 60-65). Also, Hoth teaches that report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template (fig. 4, col. 5, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoth's teaching of report definition form contains report criteria and report format. The report format include report template, begin date and end date. Thus, the report criteria and format report such as begin date and end date are different from report template to DuFresne's system in order to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 88, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "a template builder that create said template and stores said template to said database" as (col. 10, lines 20-35).

As to claim 89, DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said template includes at least one extraction....form of data". However, DuFresne teaches that the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. The #page tag extracts the data in the database to Sparks's system in order to return a correct form including a sign which tells a user what kind of text for a form, display the form in proper format, and provide emphasis to words in a Web page in different ways.

9.   Claims 51, 71, 90 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Graefe and Ishikawa.

As to claims 51 and 71, DuFresne and Hoth disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 67, except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized by at least .....to location of a reference marker and a direction in at least one of said plurality of dimensions, and wherein identifying ....portion of the content data in the direction". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as (col. 1, lines 30-65). Ishikawa teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes information with respect to location of a reference marker and a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions" as (col. 24, lines 40-50);

"wherein identifying ......content data in the direction" as (col. 24, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of displaying a form database with

different perspective and Ishikawa's teaching of a searching range for extracting the

areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the

coordinate data of said specific points to DuFresne's system in order to display a

beautiful image on screen to a user.

As to claim 90, DuFresne discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim

87, except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized by at least one

of a plurality of dimensions; the extraction instruction includes information with respect

to a location of a reference marker and a direction in one of a plurality of dimensions,

and said template runner searcher in the direction for identify said portion of content

data in the direction".

However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a

direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as (col. 1, lines 30-65). Ishikawa teaches the

claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes information with respect to location

of a reference marker and a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions......portion of

content data in the direction" as (col. 24, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of displaying a form database with

different perspective and Ishikawa's teaching of a searching range for extracting the

areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the coordinate data of said specific points to DuFresne's system in order to display a beautiful image on screen to a user.

As to claim 91, DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "template builder is used to edit and review the extraction instruction included in said template". However, DuFresne teaches that if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. This information shows that the system has included a template builder to edit a template, which can include the extraction instruction. Thus, when editing a template, the system can edit the extraction instruction too (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 10, lines 25-30). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source in order to allow a user to maintain a database.

10.   Claims 55-58 and 75-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Maejima.

As to claims 55 and 75, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation:

"displaying a sample visual form of data" as (col. 13, lines 15-30). DuFresne fails
to teach the claimed limitation "receiving user location data ......displayed sample visual
form of data; forming the extraction .....data selected by the user". However, Maejima
teaches that extracting the instruction name from the instruction name section in the
instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate
sections 825 (col. 7, lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-60). It would have been obvious to a
person of an ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to apply Maejima
teaching of instruction name from the instruction name section in the instruction
templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate sections 825 to
Spark's system in order to display data in proper format following user's desire.

As to claims 56 and 76, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing the
extraction instruction" as (col. 11, lines 30-35).

As to claims 57 and 77, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing the
identified content data in association with data.....visual forms of data" as (col. 11, lines
30-35; col. 10, lines 5-30).

As to claims 58 and 78, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing the
identified .....plurality of visual forms of data" as (col. 13, lines 15-30).

11.   Claims 59-62 and 79-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Graefe.

As to claims 59 and 79 DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation

"normalizing the data representing the visual form of data". However, Graefe teaches

the claimed limitations "the visual form of data is characterized....at least two coordinate

systems" as (col. 1, lines 35-60) , "wherein normalizing the data ....into a common

coordinate system" as (col. 1, liens 35-60; col. 2, lines 10-25). It would have been

obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

apply Graefe's teaching of the engine searches the database and returns to the user a

result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the

query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as

time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may

wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to

transform a database table from one perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of

data. For example, a user may even select data from a database table in the Microsoft

Access database component of Microsoft Office, transfer it as a single object to Excel

component as a rectangle of spreadsheet cell to DuFresne's system in order to display

a form in different dimensions following user's desire.

As to claims 60 and 80, DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "translating

coordinate references to coordinate references of a system". However, Graefe teaches

the above claimed limitations col. 1, liens 35-60; col. 2, lines 10-25.

As to claims 61 and 81, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "scaling text strings in accordance with a display device" as (col. 18, lines 35-45).

As to claims 62 and 82, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "joining and splitting text" as (col. 6, lines 50-65; col. 18, lines 35-45).

12. Claims 63, 64, 66, 83, 84, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Ferrel et al (USP 6230173).

As to claims 63 and 83, DuFresne and Hoth disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "wherein the extraction instruction locates data in a report area and inserts data located into a selected tag in association with a report corresponding to the visual form of data". However, Ferrel teaches inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrel's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format.

As to claims 64 and 84, DuFresne discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction locates data in a direction relative ......to the visual form of data". However, Ferrel teaches inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrel's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format.

As to claims 66 and 86, DuFresne and Hoth disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "the extraction inserts data into a selected tag in association with a report corresponding to the visual form of data based on data included in the report". ". However, Ferrel teaches inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrel's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format.

13.   Claims 65 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Ferrel and Petty et al (USP

6342907).

As to claims 65 and 85, DuFresne and Hoth disclose the claimed limitation

subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction

determines whether at least ...a Boolean tag in association with said report". However,

Ferrel teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction determines whether at least one

.....to visual form of data" as of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story

object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4,

lines 10-20). Petty teaches the claimed limitation "accordingly sets a Boolean tag in

association with said report" as attribute tag is a Boolean set (col. 13, lines 50-55). It

would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to apply Ferrels's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions

indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object

with tag and Petty's teaching of attribute tag is a Boolean set to DuFresne's system in

order to display a form on screen in proper format and allow a user to have certain

actions during editing a template.

14.   Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Sparks (USP 6167382).

As to claim 69, DuFresne and Hoth disclose the claimed limitation subject matter

in claim 67, except the claimed limitation "applying the template to data .....a print

operation". However, Spark teaches a user can print out a home page, which includes a template (fig. 53).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Spark's teaching of a user can print out a home page which includes a template to DuFresne's system in order to allow a user to keep a template or a record and send a template to different locations without using electronic mail.

Conclusion

15.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703-305-4393). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-746-7239 (formal communications intended for entry), or: (703)-746-7240 (informal communication labeled PROPOSED or DRAFT).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

5/20/03

SHAHID AL ALAM
PATENT EXAMINER